

Docket Operations
 U.S. Department of Transportation
 400 Seventh Street, S.W.
 Nassif Building, Room PL-401
 Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
 (Docket OST-03-15759) - 867

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:



Address:

Kevin D O'Connell
 4473 Vandenmark Rd
 S. Kent OH 44116
 44116

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

Jenn Chae
Jenn Chae
4713 Autumn Ln
Brockton, Ohio
44144

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name:

Georgia Roman

Address:

8024 Snow Rd
Palm Beach 44139

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name:

John Jackson

Address:

3080 Monticello Blvd
Clev Hts OH 44118

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: MARK FESKANICH

Address: 433 BRIDLE Ln
BEREA OH 44017

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

James J. Montgomery

Address:

3271 DEBRA COURT
MEDINA, OH 44056

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Nicole Demas

Address:

13646 Middlebrook Blvd
BrookPark, Ohio 44142

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: Robert A FEID

Address: 3722 WEST PARK RD.
CLEVELAND, OHIO
44111

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: *Susan Liller*

Address:

*21565 Quince Dr
R.R. Dr
44116*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

Mark S. Lance
MARK S. LANCE
5711 Hampstead Ave.
Painesville, OH.
44137-3923

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

Mark Grydak
10385 MI St
Erie MI 48133

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Jerry Elder

Name:

Q3 Exchange Ltd.

Address:

*New London, Ohio
44851*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: LARRY C. EVANS

Address: 23429 WESTWOOD RD.
WESTLAKE, OH 44145

12/20/2005

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: KENNETH PORVAZNIK

Address: 3406 BEAUMONT DR.
BRUNSWICK, OH 44212

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: CHARLES S FRANTZ

Address: 3791 W 210th

Fairview Park, Ohio

44126-1401

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Jeffrey S. Ford

Name:

JEFFREY S. FORD

Address:

3323 Styx Hill Road

MEDINA, OH 44136

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: DAVID JONES

David Jones
Address: 591 SAUTTER DR.
CRESCENT, PA. 15046

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,



Name: Jeffery Ree

Address: 4335 Belmont Ct.
Medina, OH 44256

12/19/05

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. - EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. - London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards, *Patrick McNamara*

Name: *PATRICK McNAMARA*

Address: *2500 HETZEL DR
PARMA, OH
44134*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name: Michael F. Rawninski

Address: 31001 Bamburgh Rd.
IV. Ridgeville, Oh 44039

December 20, 2005

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.


It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joni Gula". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Regards,".

Joni Gula
9170 Deerfield Drive
Seville, OH 44273

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

Derek J. Jorgensen
313 ADELWICK PL.
GAHANNA, OHIO
43230

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:



Address:

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Bryan T. Sigurdson

Address:

*5946 RICHMAN ROAD
SPENCER, OHIO 44275*

Docket Operations
U.S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Nassif Building, Room PL-401
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Foreign Ownership and Control
(Docket OST-03-15759)

Dear Department of Transportation:

I am writing to voice my concerns about DOT's proposed rule on actual control of U.S. airlines by foreign parties.

DOT has said that the rule is unrelated to recent aviation negotiations with the European Union to "liberalize" air travel between the United States and the 25 EU countries. But, as I now know, the rule is very much tied to DOT efforts to sign a deal with the Europeans. I have read that the EU said it will not initial a new aviation agreement with the U.S. before the EU knows that the rule will become final.

It seems to me that the DOT rule was written only to get a deal signed with the EU, and while the U.S. – EU deal gives European airlines improved access to the U.S. market, DOT's proposal does nothing for U.S. airlines that cannot operate at London's Heathrow airport. It is wrong to say Heathrow would be open under the proposed agreement because U.S. airlines like Continental still won't be able to operate at Heathrow due to lack of landing and take-off slots and lack of airport real estate. In this regard, I have to say the U.S. Government has failed to open up U.S. – London Heathrow air service while Heathrow is the top airport to use while flying to and from London.

I do not believe DOT has the authority to change U.S. aviation laws regarding foreign ownership and control of U.S. airlines. I understand members of the U.S. Congress have written letters stating the fact that Congress is the legal body to review, discuss and take action on new laws relating to U.S. airlines and their ownership and control structure. I believe my elected congressional officials are the only appropriate individuals to consider the implications of changing U.S. aviation law.

I support U.S. Government efforts to liberalize international travel but only when the liberalization occurs on an equitable level, is fair to the U.S. and when the discussion takes place in the proper forum.

For the above mentioned reasons I am urging you to withdraw the proposed rule.

Regards,

Name:

Address:

David A. [unclear]
17513 QUARRY RD
WELLINGTON, OH
44090